



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/910,055	07/23/2001	Isao Funaki	1046.1258	3643
21171	7590	10/25/2004	EXAMINER	
STAAS & HALSEY LLP SUITE 700 1201 NEW YORK AVENUE, N.W. WASHINGTON, DC 20005			PATEL, DHAIRYA A	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2151	

DATE MAILED: 10/25/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 09/910,055	Applicant(s) FUNAKI, ISAO	
	Examiner Dhairya A Patel	Art Unit 2151	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 7/23/2001.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-16 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-16 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>7/23/2001</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. Application number 09/910,055 was filed on 7/23/2001. Claims 1-16 are subject to examination.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1-4,8-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being unpatentable by Araki et al. U.S. Patent # 6,014,696 (hereinafter Araki)

2. As per claim 1, Araki teaches a server for providing information to a client via a network, (column 5 lines 34-37) comprising:

- a receiving module receiving a request for providing the information from said client, (column 6 lines 15-22) the providing request containing a piece of access site information on an access site through which said client accesses said network (column 6 lines 15-25);

- an acquisition module acquiring a piece of information corresponding to the access site information (column 6 lines 28-38); and

- a transmitting module transmitting the information acquired to said client. (column 6 lines 28-38)

3. As per claim 2, Araki teaches a server according to claim 1, further comprising a

database stored with plural items of information that should be provided to said client (column 6 lines 28-38),

-wherein said acquisition module acquires the information corresponding to the access site information out of said database (column 6 lines 28-38).

4. As per claim 3, Araki teaches a server according to claim 2, wherein said acquisition module creates a file of webpage that contains the information acquired, and (column 6 lines 46-56)

-said transmitting module transmits the created file to said client. (column 6 lines 56-60).

5. As per claim 4, Araki teaches a server according to claim 1, further comprising a database stored with files of plurality of web pages with their contents different from each other (column 9 List 1, Column 10 List 2,3,5, Column 12 List 9)

-wherein said acquisition module acquires the file corresponding to the access site information out of said database, and (column 7 lines 4-20)

-said transmitting module transmits the acquired file to said client. (column 7 lines 4-20)

6. As per claim 5, Araki teaches a server according to claim 1, wherein the information is a piece of information for indicating a location where the web page is stored. (column 6 lines 51-60)

7. As per claims 8-11, teaches same limitations as claims 1-4 therefore claims 8-11 are rejected under same basis.

8. As per claims 13-16, teaches same limitations as claims 1-4 therefore claims 13-

16 are rejected under same basis.

9. As per claim 12, Araki teaches a system comprising:

- a client; and (column 5 lines 34-37)

- a server for providing information to said client via a network,

- (column 5 lines 34-37)

- wherein said client transmits a request for providing the information to said server, the information providing request containing a piece of access site information on an access site through which said client accesses said network (column 6 lines 15-25);

- said server receives the providing request, acquires a piece of information corresponding to the access site information, and transmits the acquired information to said client. (column 6 lines 28-38).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

10. Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Araki in view of Ames et al. U.S. Patent # 6,058,0429 (hereinafter Ames).

11. As per claim 6, Araki teaches a server according to claim 1, but fails to teach the access site information is a source address of the providing request. Ames teaches the access site information is a source address of the providing request. (Column 1

lines 56-65). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to implement Araki's server with the access site information as the source address of the providing request in order to find out the address from which the request came from so it could be used later.

It is for this reason that one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to implement Araki's server with the access site information as the source address of the providing request so that it could send a reply message back to request that was made.

12. Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Araki in view of Smith et al. U.S. Patent Publication # 2002/0087530 (hereinafter Smith).

13. As per claim 7, Araki teaches a server according to claim 4, wherein said database is stored with the files of the plurality of web pages but fails to teach each web pages containing the same information expressed in a different language.

Smith teaches web pages contain the same information expressed in different language. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to implement Araki's server where database is stored with the files of the plurality of web pages containing the same information expressed in a different language in order to be used in different operating systems.

It is for this reason that one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to implement Araki's server where database is stored with the files of the plurality of web pages containing the same information expressed in a different language so that it could be used depending on sources address and different operating systems.

Conclusion

14. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

15. A shortened statutory period for response to this action is set to expire **3 (three) months and 0 (zero) days** from the mail date of this letter. Failure to respond within the period for response will result in **ABANDONMENT** of the applicant (see 35 U.S.C 133, M.P.E.P 710.02, 710.02(b)).

16.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Dhairya A Patel whose telephone number is (571) 272-4066. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Zarni Maung can be reached on (571) 272-3939. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).


ZARNI MAUNG
PRIMARY EXAMINER